

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 17 and 20 to 36 are the pending claims being examined in the application, of which Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 17, 24, 25, 28 and 31 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 17 and 24 are being amended, and Claims 25 to 36 are being added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, Claims 1 to 17 and 20 to 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,194 (Sheth), Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sheth and U.S. Patent No. 6,925,495 (Hedge), and Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sheth and U.S. Patent No. 7,003,726 (Walker). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

By way of introduction, the present application is directed to systems and methods for presenting a uniform display of metadata to a user experiencing a media file that has associated metadata, through a user interface, so that a user sees the same type of metadata in the same place in the user interface for each experienced media file.

Claim 1 recites a system for providing media content in a network. The system comprises one or more servers configured to generate an interface at a site on the network for display on a user computer. The one or more servers are further configured to define a set of metadata attributes relating to media files to be displayed in specific locations in the interface, compile a plurality of media files for use with the interface, associate metadata attributes from the set of metadata attributes with each of the plurality of media files, and map each of the associated metadata attributes to a respective predetermined location in the interface, so that in the interface for the user each of the associated metadata attributes appears at its respective predetermined location in the interface for each media file of the plurality of media files.

Sheth fails to teach or to suggest each and every one of the features of the claimed invention, particularly as regards providing media content in an interface displayed to a user, such that metadata attributes are associated with a plurality of media files and mapped to specific locations in the interface, each of the associated attributes being mapped to a respective predetermined location in an interface for the user so that in the interface for the user each of the

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

associated metadata attributes appears at its respective predetermined location in the interface for each of the media files.

Sheth focuses on the extraction of metadata from a web page, and on the storage of the extracted metadata in a database for querying and retrieval. The Office Action cites col. 11, lines 35 and 36 and col. 8, lines 9 to 62 of Sheth. However, the cited portion describes the extraction tool used by Sheth to locate and then extract the metadata from the web page. This cannot be said to teach, suggest or disclose metadata attributes associated with media files being mapped to a respective predetermined location in a user interface, such that each of the associated metadata attributes appears at its respective predetermined location in the interface for each media file. In stark contrast, Sheth presupposes that information appears at different locations in a web page and seeks to locate it, while the present claims are directed to categorizing metadata associated with a media file so it can be placed in a predetermined location of a generated user interface while the user experiences the media file. In this way, regardless of how the associated metadata might be intended to appear, as recited in the present claims the associated metadata will appear in its predetermined location in the generated user interface, thereby ensuring a consistent user experience.

More particularly, the extraction tool described in Sheth (at col. 11, line 11 to col. 12, line 33) searches a web page to find a pattern identified in an extraction rule in order to locate information to extract from the web page. As stated in Sheth, at col. 12, lines 23 to 33:

“[a]n example of a typical extraction rule is given in FIG. 9. Each extraction rule will contain potentially three components. The first component 1310 designates the name of the attribute. The second component 1320 indicates whether multiple assets are generated from a single data set subject to extraction and whether the attribute will be found in the common (shared) text, not the text belonging to the individual assets. The third component 1330 designates the pattern for which the extractor should search to locate the value for the attribute designated in the first component 1310.”

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

As can be seen from the above description, the disclosure of Sheth is directed to a different problem and solution than that described and claimed in the instant application, and cannot be said to teach, suggest or disclose each metadata attribute appearing at its respective predetermined location in the interface for each of the plural media files.

The Office Action cites Figure 13 and col. 15, lines 12 to 30 of Sheth as displaying an interface for a user. However, nothing in the cited portions of Sheth teaches, suggests or discloses mapping each one of the metadata attributes associated with media files to a respective predetermined location in a user interface, such that each of the associated metadata attributes appears at its respective predetermined location in the interface for all media files.

Figures 13A to 13C of Sheth, which are referenced at col. 15, lines 12 to 30 and cited in the Office Action, merely show a dynamically-created customized interface used to search a database, not to an interface that displays media file metadata in predetermined locations. The user interface shown in Figures 13A to 13C of Sheth cannot be said to teach, suggest or disclose defining metadata attributes for display in specific locations in an interface, associating metadata attributes from the set of metadata attributes defined with each of a plurality of media files and mapping each one of the metadata attributes associated with media files to a respective predetermined location in an interface, such that each of the associated metadata attributes appears at its respective predetermined location in the interface for each of the plural media files.

Sheth fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every one of the elements claimed in Claim 1. Accordingly, since Sheth is missing multiple elements of the claim, Sheth can not be relied upon as an anticipatory reference, nor can it form the basis of a satisfactory obviousness rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Claim 1 (and the claims that depend therefrom) should be patentable over Sheth. In addition, Claim 4 (and the claims that dependent therefrom) should be patentable over Sheth for at least the same reasons.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 24 should be patentable over Sheth. Furthermore and while the above-discussed reasons should be sufficient reason for Claim 24 to be patentable over Sheth, Claim 24 should be patentable over the applied art for the additional reasons discussed below.

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

The Office Action concedes that Sheth fails to teach, suggest or disclose authenticating a user's authorization to access certain media content, and compiling a plurality of media files for use with a user interface, the plurality of compiled media files comprising only the user's authorized media content.

The portions of Walker cited by the Office Action describes a system login for a user to log into the system, and a business server that generates a user interface for a validated user. The cited portions of Walker cannot be said to be the same as authenticating a user's authorization to access certain media content, and compiling a plurality of media files for use with a user interface, the plurality of compiled media files comprising only the user's authorized media content.

In view of the above, Sheth and Walker, alone or in any hypothetical combination (if one is even permitted, a point which is in no way conceded herein), fail to teach, suggest or disclose each and every one of the elements claimed in Claim 24. In view of the foregoing, therefore, it is submitted that Claim 24 should be patentable over the applied art.

New Claims 25, 28 and 31 each have features of an interface for display on a user computer, which interface comprises a region to display media content of a plurality of media files, selectable indicia corresponding to one or more playlists, a region to display indicia of each of said plurality of media files identified by a selected one of said playlists, and a region to display indicia of an autoplay function configured to control an order in which each of said plurality of media files identified by a selected one of said playlists is to be experienced using said interface. In addition, Claim 31 has the features of authenticating a user's authorization to access certain media content, and filtering the plurality of media files based on the user's authorization to access certain media content such that the user interface for the user includes selectable indicia for only those media files corresponding to the certain media content. Nothing in the applied art teaches, suggests or discloses these additional features.

In view of the above, since the applied art fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every one of the elements claimed in Claims 25, 28 and 31, it is submitted that Claims 25, 28 and 31 should be patentable over the applied art.

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

Claim 7 recites a method of providing media content to a plurality of users over a network. The method comprises the steps of compiling a playlist that contains one or more unique identifiers which identify one or more media files, and determining whether a user-selectable autoplay function is engaged for a given one of the plurality of users. In a case that the autoplay function is determined to be engaged, a sequence in which the user is to experience media content corresponding to the one or more media files is determined based on an ordering of the unique identifiers in the playlist. In a case that the autoplay function is determined to be disengaged, the sequence in which the user is to experience media content corresponding to the one or more media files is determined based on input from the user without regard to the ordering of the unique identifiers in the playlist.

Sheth fails to teach, suggest or disclose at least the features of a user-selectable autoplay function, determining whether the user-selectable autoplay function is engaged for a given one of the plurality of users, determining a sequence in which the user is to experience media content corresponding to the one or more media files, which are identified by unique identifiers contained in a playlist, based on a determination of whether or not the autoplay function is engaged, such that in a case that the autoplay function is determined to be engaged the sequence is based on an ordering of the unique identifiers in the playlist, and in a case that the autoplay function is disengaged the sequence is based on input from the user without regard to the ordering of the unique identifiers in the playlist.

Figure 6 of Sheth cited in the Office Action shows the contents of an asset file which contains a set of attribute-value pairs for attribute information extracted from a web page about an asset, which attribute information is then stored in a metadata database. However, the asset file of Sheth cannot be said to be the same as a data file that contains one or more identifiers which identify one or more media files, the contents of the data file being used to determine a sequence in which a user is to experience media content corresponding to the one or more media files in a case that an autoplay function is determined to be engaged.

Col. 7, lines 5 to 8 and col. 15, lines 12 to 30 of Sheth cited by the Office Action describe a one-click operation which returns a user to the web site from which an audio or video asset was originally extracted. When the user selects a URL associated with an audio or video asset, the

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

one-click operation opens a web browser window which contains the web page of the web site from which the audio or video asset was extracted, so that the user can access the audio or video asset from the source of the asset on the web. This cannot be said to teach, suggest or disclose a user-selectable autoplay function, and/or determining whether the autoplay function is engaged, using an ordering of unique in a data file to determine a sequence in which a user is to experience media content corresponding to the one or more media files identified by the unique identifier in a case that the autoplay function is engaged, and determining the sequence in which a user is to experience the media content based on user input in a case that the autoplay function is determined to be disengaged.

Nothing in the cited portions of Sheth can be said to teach, suggest or disclose determining whether the user-selectable autoplay function is engaged for a given one of the plurality of users, determining a sequence in which the user is to experience media content corresponding to the one or more media files, which are identified by unique identifiers contained in a playlist, based on a determination of whether or not the autoplay function is engaged, such that in a case that the autoplay function is determined to be engaged the sequence is based on an ordering of the unique identifiers in the playlist, and in a case that the autoplay function is disengaged the sequence is based on input from the user without regard to the ordering of the unique identifiers in the playlist.

Sheth therefore fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every one of the elements claimed in Claim 7. Accordingly, since Sheth is missing multiple elements of the claim, Sheth can not be relied upon as an anticipatory reference, nor can it form the basis of a satisfactory obviousness rejection. In view of the foregoing, therefore, it is submitted that Claim 7 (and the claims that depend therefrom) should be patentable over Sheth. In addition, Claims 12 and 17 (and the claims that dependent therefrom) should be patentable over Sheth for at least the same reasons.

The claims which depend from the independent claims discussed above are believed patentable for at least the same reasons discussed herein. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. In this regard, the art applied against the

Appl. No. 10/670,099  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-012901

dependent Claim 23, namely Hedge, cannot be said to remedy the deficiencies in the applied art noted above.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.


The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance therefore be issued in this case. Should matters remain which the Examiner believes could be resolved in a further telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

In this regard, Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by phone in California (Pacific Standard Time) at (714) 708-6500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below-listed address.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-2638. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number is referred when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 17, 2006

  
Carole A. Quinn  
Reg. No. 39,000  
Email: quinn@gtlaw.com  
Phone: (714) 708-6500

Customer Number 32361  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
Met Life Building  
200 Park Avenue, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10166  
Phone: (212) 801-9200  
Fax: (212) 801-6400

OC 286086886

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**